593 not considered bad for a man to beat his wife." In the case
593 of ill-treatment by the husband, her father may take the
*613 matter to the corporate head. Traditionally, the corporate
[792] head would order the husband to move his tent next to the
tend of the "holy man" or some other third party, so that
he would be dissuaded against such behavior. Another reason
• [586] for this is so that the girl might have witnesses to support
her petition for divorce should the husband continue to beat
her. I heard of no wife-beating while I was in al-Qasr.

595 The Quran states that a man may lawfully take four
[779] wives, but that if he feels he cannot treat each of them
equally, he should take only one (Sura IV:3 and 129). The
Bedouins are conscientious in practicing this rule, though
595 perhaps not for religious reasons. If a man has more than
593 one wife, he must spend an equal amount of time with each.
Conflict between co-wives is lessened by the fact that a man
will have separate tents, or rooms in the case of a house,
for each wife. A man will not buy a dress or a piece of jewelry
for one wife without buying a copy of it for all other wives.
595 On a trip to the Siwa Oasis, I was accompanied by a man who
593 had three wives and wished to bring them a gift of basketry
114 upon his return. He was successful in buying two baskets
which were similar but could not find a comparable third in
[431] the oasis market. In dismay, he made a gift of the baskets
to me and returned with no souvenirs at all. One of my in-

582
[584] she could marry no man.

582
578 Most of the older Bedouins say that bint 'amm marriage as it is practiced in the desert is an evil, that it causes nothing but trouble. They say that if there are bad feelings between two men they will place claims upon each other's sister with the intention of preventing the girls from ever marrying. The younger Bedouins say that "it is better to marry the bint 'amm than to let a stranger take her." The
[182]
[571] claim on the bint 'amm, of course, should be seen as a basis for social relationships between groups, regardless of any
[586] conflict it may or may not lead to. This is why the Bedouins say that a man "will never divorce his bint 'amm, because if he does that means that she is no good." It follows, then, that if "she is no good" none of her other paternal cousins will marry her. Implicit here is the reference to the making
[182] and breaking of group ties. Similarly, to regulate and to maximize kinship ties, a man can claim only one of his father's brother's daughters. In the case where there is only one bint 'amm, her eldest cousin has first claim to her.
582
578 This sometimes causes conflict between brothers as the fol-
159 lowing informant's story indicates.

> The father of Salih and Aziz was dead which meant that Aziz, being the elder, would have to furnish the brideprice if Salih were to marry first. In fact, Salih wanted to marry his bint 'amm. Aziz refused him permission to do so: Aziz had first claim to the bint 'amm, and, also, he thought that the brideprice which

583 554 556 expected. The price is set by the corporate group but can vary, and usually does, from one tertiary segment to another. The wealthier tertiary segments tend to have higher bride-prices. This is explained by the fact that they occupy a "higher status" on the prestige scale, and also, by the fact that they wish to carefully control and maintain this status.

[435] For instance, "between cousins" of 'Ailit Ma'fas the mahr is fixed at 60 Egyptian pounds, but "a man can pay more out of generosity if he wishes." Hence, a member of the Ma'fas lineage can increase his prestige within and without his family by paying beyond that which is expected of him. In this case, "generosity" is the variable related to a man's

583 554 556 435 place on the scale of prestige. On the other hand, in another "poorer" lineage, 'Ailit Zaghara, the mahr is 30 L.E. to members of the in-group but "the stranger will pay 60 to 80 L.E., according to the father's wealth." The largest and most famous mahr payment in the area was made by the wealthiest man in al-Qasr who paid seven camels (each worth about 150 L.E.) for his son's wife. The highest fixed mahr in al-Qasr was that of Bait Bu Tarram of 'Ailit Lazumi. It was 100 L.E. for members of 'Ailit Lazumi and, accordingly, much more for strangers. This mahr is in contrast to the average for the area which is about 30 L.E. within the secondary group.

586 521 784 Divorce is a forbidden topic of conversation in al-Qasr. Any talk about one's wife, mother, or sister is considered injudicious.

586 829 judicious. Another issue which enters here is the desire on the part of the individual to maintain his privacy--especially where an infringement of it could result in a change of his tax status. The Bedouins think that it is wise to keep the government uninformed about the exact size of their family.

586 829 123 When I first asked a question concerning divorce, I was politely taken aside and told that I do not speak about divorce to a man, and especially when his sons are present.

586 Two cases of divorce took place while I was in the field. In the one, the wife claimed that her husband was impotent. She took this complaint to her father who then confronted the husband with it; the result was a divorce. Although the man denied that he was sterile, this was his second childless marriage and he felt it wise not to contest the case. It becomes very important to know, in the case of Bedouin divorce, which partner cannot meet the requirements of the marriage. If it is the woman, she will return to her father's house and the father must then return the price of mahr (brideprice). If it is the husband, when his wife returns to her father's house he must pay her (not her father, in this case) a sum, called mu'akhkhir al-sadaaq ("the balance of the marriage contract"), which is equal to that of the original mahr. Actually, there are three times when a mahr price may be paid in al-Qasr: the original mahr is paid at the time of the marriage; the mu'akhkhir al-sadaaq is paid

583 768 595

586 583 768 595 at the time of divorce (if the husband is in fault), and also at the time of the husband's death; and, sadaaq al-musaama ("price of friendship") is paid to the wife when her husband takes a second, third or fourth wife.

586 158 The second divorce case which happened while I was in al-Qasr involved, what seems to be, an instance of psychotic behavior. A girl, who had married shortly before I arrived in the field, would fall into a deep sleep every time she entered her husband's house. Each time her father would come for her and take her home until she had recovered. But upon her return, three different times, she became ill again. Finally, her father and the husband agreed that this marriage would not work, and the father returned the mahr to the man. This case lasted over the period of almost a year while I lived in al-Qasr. I suggested to the father that perhaps his daughter did not wish to be married to this man but he assured me that "she loved him very much."

586 If the girl's father is dead, so that she cannot return to his house at the time of divorce, she will go to live with the brother who needs her services. It then becomes the duty of the brother to make another marriage for his sister, and in the case that he does it becomes his right to claim the mahr for himself. The Bedouins say that virginity, or the lack of it, in the case of the divorced woman is no issue; just so a man knows "she is from a good family."

586 589 593 583

•586 851 * 613 Naturally, according to the rule of patriliny, all children from a marriage belong to the husband and become members of his lineage. Should divorce occur while a woman is nursing, she will take the child with her and it will be returned after weaning. Sometimes the husband will permit the wife to keep one child--always a girl--in order "to keep her company."

587 The practice of the sororate has been noted. The Bedouins also believe that "a man should marry his brother's widow so that she will have someone to help her with the children." But I have no data on the frequencies of these practices. When I gathered my data on marriage, my informants 12 58 would give me only the name of the tribe or lineage into which a man married, and never did I get the name of a man's wife. [829] One lineage in al-Qasr, entirely refused to give me data on genealogy or marriage because, as one leader said, "it is not decent to speak of these things with people.") Sororal 595 polygny is forbidden (Quran IV:23), and the Bedouins say that a man cannot marry more than one bint 'amm. Marriage 182 practices, such as sororate and levirate, I interpret as [587] patterns which maintain structural continuity and political [582] advantage. The custom of permitting a man to marry only one of his father's brother's daughters may be seen as a precaution against intensifying authority relations and the degree of segmentation.

671 562 Implicit in the 'awaiyid is the assumption that the woman is less responsible for her deeds and something of a weakling. The Bedouins have a proverb which says that "the devil whispers in the ear of the woman." If a woman slays a [682] man, intentionally or accidentally, the diiya is considered as for unintentional killing. Where sex offenses are concerned, it makes a difference if the act takes place in the man's (i.e. the husband's) tent or in the desert, and, of course, it makes a difference whether or not it is a case of rape or adultery. If a man finds another man and his wife in his dwelling in the act of adultery, he may kill the man and pay the diiya for unintentional killing. From this diiya, he deducts the amount of the bride-price and 50 L.E. for trespassing. The fine for rape ranges from 10 L.E. to 100 L.E. On the other hand, if intercourse takes place with the woman's consent, the fine is only 5 L.E. or 10 L.E. If a virgin is deflowered, the fine will be 100 L.E., and the man will have to marry her, paying the bride-price asked for by the girl's father and going through the normal procedure for marriage. Where offenses involve unmarried women, all fines are paid to the father. In cases concerning married women, fines go to the husband. According to the [586] Bedouins, it would be a great dishonor to the man's family [558] if the husband were not to divorce his wife after it becomes known that she has been promiscuous. They said that if a man

114
792
562 The second, rather complex, case occurred while I was in the field. Once again, the role of the "holy man" is shown to operate in cases dealing with women. Shown here also is an interesting example of the cultural definition of abnormality.

*613 No Date. Case: Quarrel between 'Ailit al-Abaidi ('Ali Abyad)
578 and 'Ailit al-Afrad ('Ali Abyad) over marriage rights. A man
582 from al-Abaidi agreed that his daughter could marry a man but
792 the rest of the 'aiela did not approve of this marriage. Since the man could not go to his 'aqila, who disapproved of the marriage, he took his problem to a "holy man." The "holy man" decided that the girl should marry the man she wanted to marry, but he was afraid that this would cause trouble in the 'aiela. The "holy man" decided to marry the man and woman, [586] and then to divorce them for a period of one year so that the conflict would abate. The girl's father knew of this marriage but the other members of the 'aiela did not. After a period of one year, the groom went to the "holy man" and said: 'Decide anything that I can do, but I must have the girl." The "holy [681] man" decided to make him pay a kubaara (expiation) fee of [684] 100 L.E. to the girl's 'aiela, and he married them again.

*613 Date: 1965. Case: Quarrel within a tertiary segment of the
619 Qinaishat tribe concerning marriage rights. A girl from the
578 Qinaishat tribe had refused to marry her paternal cousin, but
582 he was insistent upon his right to have her.

582 time of the study. I have no information about the marital history of
[114] the men included in the genealogies. This is particularly important if
[586] we realize that the frequency of divorce in the area is quite high and that there is a certain prohibition against ever marrying within a certain degree of relationship of his first wife.

582 According to the Koraan, a man is forbidden to marry certain
779 classes of women. Some of these women are permanently prohibited and others are only temporarily so. Marriage is forbidden with what are called the "maharem" (sing. mahram or non-marriageables). They are one's female ascendants and descendants; the former wives of one's ascendants or desendants; one's sister and the female descendants of one's sister and brother; one's paternal and maternal aunts and the sisters and aunts of the ascendants; one's mother-in-law and all female ascendants of one's wife. Marriage with the first cousin and the half-brother's half-sister (from another marriage) is therefore permitted. The second category of
[853] forbidden women are those related to the man by nursing. The wet nurse takes the place of the mother, and her relatives are treated as if she was the actual mother of the person in question.

In addition to the above, there is the prohibition of the simultaneous marriage of two women who are related to each other to the extent that had one of them been male and the other female, they would have come to the forbidden degree in marriage. This latter prohibition is not a permanent one and is restricted to the marriage of the two women at the same time. As soon as the marriage with one of them is dissolved, there is no prohibition on marrying the other one. Yet, although aware of the lecense given by the Islamic law to such marriage,

585 legal guardian and considered a bride price to compensate the father or
583 the legal guardian of the bride. In earlier times the bride received
779 none of the mahr, although she usually got a sadaq or bridal gift for
43 herself. In Islamic Arabia, the mahr and the sadaq became indistin-
[78] guishable and were given to the woman and took the form of a legal gift
[71] for affecting the marriage. The Koraan no longer contains the concept
[78] of the purchase of the wife, and the mahr becomes a compensation which
the woman has to claim in all cases. The Koraan demands a bridal gift
for a legal marriage: "And give them whom ye have enjoyed their reward
as a wedding gift" (Sura, iv. 24), and again, "And give the women their
[586] dowries voluntarily" (Sura, iv. 3). According to the Koraan, the mahr
remains the property of the wife and remains her own even if the marriage
is dissolved by divorce. But although it took the form of a gift, the
mahr remained in Islamic law a prerequisite for the legalization of the
marriage. It is only upon the giving of the mahr that the marriage is
considered valid. No marriage is legal, according to the Islamic law,
unless that transfer of the mahr is affected. Mutual consent of the
two parties to forfeit the mahr does not change that rule, and the mar-
58 riage is considered void. According to Muslim jurisprudence, marriage
675 is a contract ('acd) made betweeen the bridegroom and the bride or her
184 wali or guardian. An essential element in that contract is the mahr.
The jurists themselves are not sure about the nature of the mahr. Some
regard it as practically a purchase money or as an equivalent ('iwad)
for the possession of the woman and the rights over her, so it is like
a price paid in a contract of sale; while other jurists see in the mahr
a legal symbol, a mark of honor and a proper legal security of property
for the woman.

583 [584] Among Awlad Ali the payment of the bridewealth signifies the completion of the marriage contract. The mahr is not paid to the woman but 583 178 to her father or closest male kin. Usually the mahr is paid in money. This, however, seems to be a recent phenomenon. Until the turn of the century, according to informants, the mahr was paid only in sheep and 583 178 184 goats. The practice is still followed by a number of tribal segments of Ali Ahmar who occupy the western most part of the area where pasture is more abundant and reliable and where the permanent pasture of the green mountains of Cyrenaica is close by. Other tribal segments still insist that at least one-fourth of the mahr should be paid in livestock, but the majority of the people accept money. The main purpose of the 583 [584] [182] mahr among Awlad Ali is to legalize the marriage contract and to put emphasis on the reciprocal oblications that the marriage created between the two families of the bride and the groom. It also works as an insurance for good behavior on the part of both the husband and the wife. 583 593 586 If the husband mistreats his wife or fails to give her the rights legally hers by marriage, he risks the chance of losing the mahr and being forced to divorce her. On the other hand, if the wife fails to behave in the customary way expected from a wife, the husband could divorce her and have the right to get back his mahr. This is particularly inconvenient in cases where all or part of the mahr is paid in livestock, in which case it becomes part of the father's herd and hard to take away in case of divorce. It is therefore in the interest of her family to keep the marriage. In this way their interference in the marriage is checked. [591] [592] This is especially important among Awlad Ali where, although the marriage is usually patrilocal, the woman retains membership in her father's household even after marriage.

593 As a girl in her father's household, the woman is under the direct authority of her father, who is responsible for her. When the father dies, this responsibility, as well as the authority, goes to her brother or her closest male kin in the order specified earlier. At marriage the [591] girl usually moves to live with her husband, and this subjects her to [606] his control and sometimes to that of his parents, if the couple lives with them. But the authority of the husband over his wife remains secondary to that of her father. The woman's membership in her father's 593 household does not cease with marriage, and the strength of her rela- 574 tions to her kin is maintained by their frequent visits to her new residence and by her occasional visits to them. This right of visitation 593 cannot be denied by the husband who not only has to allow such visits, 574 but is also required to treat members of his wife's family, especially 606 her father, with great respect and hospitality. If the husband fails [586] to do so, the wife's father can order her to leave her husband and go back to his household with him.

This point is illustrated by the case of Muftah from the Esheibat tribe in the area of Matruh, whose older daughter is married to Hemeida from the Geneishat segment, which lives in the area of Fokah some 80 miles to the east of Matruh. One winter day in 1965, while passing near the area where his daughter lived, Muftah decided to pay her a visit. When he arrived, her husband was not at home; he was in the market in a nearby town selling sheep. When he came back late that evening, he greeted Muftah with the customary slaughter of a goat and invited the neighbors to the occasion. After dinner Muftah wanted to rest. It was a very hot night, so his son-in-law brought a rug and spread it outside the tent in the cool air. After that he retired to his tent where he spent the night inside.

spent the night inside. In the morning Muftah ordered his daughter to pack her clothes because she was to leave with him. He refused to give her husband any explanation as to why he was taking his daughter away. The husband could not prevent him from taking her away because, as he said, "He is her father and has the right to take her away with him at any time."

When the wife did not return for two weeks, her husband went to her father's house to take her, but her father refused to let her go. Hemeida then went to a religious man in the area and asked him to intervene in the matter and see why Muftah had taken away his wife. He also asked him to arrange a mi'ad with Muftah to discuss the matter.

The religious man was selected in this case because he was a close friend of Muftah and was believed to have influence over him. He was also known throughout the area to be fair and of sound opinion. It is important in the cases of disputes that the person selected as a mardi is known as a wise and fair man. It is only then that he is able to mediate between the two parties without being accused of taking sides. The religious men, members of the Murabiteen tribes in the area, by their relative position outside the formal tribal organization of the Sa'adi tribes, are the most likely candidates for such activity. Yet, this is not always the case. For this aspect of assumed impartiality is frequently balanced off by the fact that these religious men lack the support of a powerful tribal segment behind them. To be effective, the mardi has to be respected, not only for his personal qualities, but also for being a member of a respectable tribal segment whose power lends authority to the mardi's decision. This is not usually the case with the client tribes of Murabiteen. Wealth in many cases is also considered an important

Wealth in many cases is also considered an important requirement for the selection of the mardi. This does not mean that religious men in the area have no role in dispute settlement, for they do. It simply means that the mardi is selected according to a number of criteria that vary from case to case, and that in some of these cases sound wisdom and fairness characteristic of religious men are not enough basis for their selection as mardis. This means that the religious men have no special mediatory role based on their religious nature alone. In certain cases religious men offer the best possibility for mediation; in others, a non-religious person might offer a better chance for settling the dispute. In cases of women seeking divorce from their husbands, the wealth of the mediator, more than anything else, seems to determine the selection of the man whom the woman asks to negotiate on her behalf, a point to which I will return later in the chapter.

The Mi'ad was held in the house of Muftah. Present at the mi'ad were Muftah, his son-in-law, Hemeida, the heads of households in Muftah's camp (one of them was his brother and the other five were members of different tribal segments), my driver (who was a member of the neighboring Sanagrah tribal segment), myself, and the religious man. After the tea was served, the religious man said that the discussion should start. He reminded the gathering that this case is a family one and should not develop into a larger dispute. "After all, the daughter's husband is a son, and the case is actually a misunderstanding between a father and a son and should be viewed in that context." Then he turned to Muftah and said that in that spirit he was asking him why he had taken his daughter away from her husband. Muftah said that he had taken his daughter away

593 Muftah said that he had taken his daughter away
594 to punish Hemeida for what he thought was disrespectful behavior. He
606 then proceeded to descirbe how Hemeida, after bringing the blanket out
586 for Muftah, went inside and spent the night with his wife, defying the
627 basic rule of not showing intimacy in the presence of older people,
792 especially the parents or parents-in-law. For, to show such intimacy
888 is a sign of disrespect. He demanded that Hemeida pay him "kabara"
[681] for his injured pride. The term kabara refers to the adjective "kebir"
[558] (lit. respected or big man). Kabara is the fine paid for belittling someone by word or deed. Muftah insisted that he would not allow his daughter to return to her husband until Hemeida had paid that kabara. Hemeida conceded the fact that intimacy constitutes an insult; but he insisted that his action did not constitute an act of intimacy with his wife, but was a matter of convenience and necessity, since he had only
593 two blankets, and the only one left was that inside the tent. Muftah
574 became angry and started shouting at Hemeida, who, in turn, started
606 shouting back; it became impossible to follow what was being said.
586 The religious man interfered in the discussion, trying to stop the argu-
627 ment between Muftah and Hemeida. The others attending the mi'ad also
792 [578] interfered. The religious man and two neighbors took Muftah outside the tent while Muftah's brother tried to calm Hemeida down. The other members of the group also calmed Hemeida, reminding him that he was the younger person and must be more tolerant of older people. They also reminded Hemeida that Muftah was his father-in-law and had the right to take his daughter away any time he chose. They urged him to "defeat the devil" [681] and to apologize to his father-in-law and pay him kabara. He seemed convinced but insisted that all he was going to pay was five pounds and a goat. Muftahh brother and one of the neighbors then left the tent and

593 went to see Muftah and his company. Half an hour later the religious
594 man came and took Hemeida aside and talked to him in a very low voice,
606 then left the tent again. A few minutes more had passed; everyone re-
586 turned to the tent; Muftah was not angry anymore. The religious man
629 read the fatha, or the beginning sura of the Koraan, then said that the
792 souls were now pure and that Hemeida was considered as a son of Muftah
[779] and that disagreements such as this should not alter the good relations between the two. He said that the devil had found his way into the souls of the two people, but now, thanks to God and the good people present, they both had come back to their senses. Hemeida then rose and went to where his father-in-law was sitting and shook hands with him. Then he
[81] handed the religious man ten pounds which the latter passed to Muftah and promised to send him a goat as a gift to his daughter. Muftah left the tent and went to the tent of the women. When he came back he announced that a goat had been slaughtered and that everyone was invited to eat. Everybody then left and Muftah promised to return his daughter to her husband the following day.

593 While the right of the father to take his daughter away from her
606 husband constitutes a check on the authority of the latter and insures
557 the wife good treatment by her husband and her in-laws, not infrequently
586 that right has been invoked for personal or individual interest on the
[429] part of the woman's father or her closest male kin. Several cases have been cited in the area where the father or guardian had invoked the right to force the husband to concede to certain demands of the wife's guardian, even when the wife objected to those demands or disagreed with her guardian. One of these is the case of Mabroka who is married to a distant

593
606
557
586

member of the same tribe. At the time that the dispute had occurred she had been married for fifteen years and had four children ranging in age from thirteen to two years. The husband possessed a piece of land on the coast where a few olive and fig trees were growing. The husband, Mukheimer, made no use of either the land or the trees. Then, in 1966, the father became employed by the government organization in the area where his daughter and her husband lived and where the land was. He asked his son-in-law to give him the right to use the land for one pound a year. Mukheimer, who at that time worked part-time for the same government organization as a driver, refused. The reason was that his job with the government made it possible for him to apply for a power pump to be installed over the Roman well that existed on the land, and he intended to utilize the land himself. All attempts to convince Hukheimer to let him use the land failed. Then one day Mukheimer came back to his tent to find that his father-in-law had taken his wife and the youngest child and left the other three children with the second wife. The father-in-law told the second wife to inform Mukheimer that if he wanted his wife and child back, he had to think about the land he wanted to take possession of. Mukheimer tried to discuss the matter with his father-in-law, buth the latter refused to see him. After a month there were rumors that the daughter was not happy that her father had taken her away from her husband and children and that she wanted to go back to her family. She asked a number of people to help her, including myself, since her father was one of my informants at that time; but he insisted that the only way Mukheimer could have his wife and child back was by giving him the rights to the land. Mukheimer, on the other hand, threatened to divorce his wife and marry another woman if his father-in-law did not return his wife.

593 606 559 586 [114] The case persisted for more than two months with no sign that either party was willing to give into the demands of the other. I left the area before any solution to the case was achieved.

584 578 606 [574] Another relevant case is one which involved a dispute between Hassan Hassanein from the Sanagrah tribe and the father-in-law of his daughter who was also from the same tribe and who lived in the same area. The case started when Hassanein was visited by a friend from the Zeheibat tribe in Matruh, an old man of 60 or 70 years. During the night that this guest spent at Hassanein's house, they got to talking about marriage and the fact that although his guest was a wealthy and respected man, he had only one wife. After a lengthy talk, it seemed that the old man was convinced that he should have a second wife and asked Hassanein if he knew of a suitable girl to marry. Hassanein suggested his daughter's sister-in-law. Hassanein took the prospective groom to the tent of his daughter's father-in-law and discussed the matter with the father of the prospective bride who agreed to marry his daughter to Hassanein's guest if he paid the sume of 200 pounds, in addition to slaughtering a number of goats and presenting him with the appropriate presents. When the man agreed to the terms, the fatha was read to signify the agreement between the two parties. Hassanein left the man to spend the night in the camp of his future in-laws. In the morning the groom told the bride's father that he must go to nearby Alexandria to bring the money for the bride price. When he came back late that afternoon, he paid the money and set a date for the wedding the next Thursday and then left for Matruh to prepare for the arrival of the new wife.

584 583 578 606 [575] [576]

584 578 606 686 Two days after the groom left, the bride's father (who is at the same time Hassanein's daughter's father-in-law) came to Hassanein and told him that the marriage was called off and that he should send a letter to the groom telling him the news. The reasons given by the bride's father were that the groom showed improper manners when he stayed overnight at the camp and that he followed the prospective bride to the water well to have a close look at her. He gave the money to Hassanein and asked him to return it to the man in Matruh. Hassanein was very disappointed and considered this an insult to him, since he was the mediator in that marriage, and insisted that the bride's father go on with the marriage. When the latter refused, Hassanein went to his daughter and ordered her to leave with him. Her husband was there and could not refuse to let her go with her father, even when Hassanein made it clear that her husband could not have her back unless his father kept his agreement with Hassanein's guest. Elewah, the daughter's husband, asked for a mi'ad to discuss the matter with his father-in-law. The mi'ad was held in Hassanein's house and was attended by Hassanein, his son-in-law, and two people from a different lineage, each selected by one of the disputing parties. Hassanein refused to give any reason for taking his daughter away from her husband except that he was exercising his rights. Eleway, on the other hand, insisted that Hassanein was not justified in his actions and that it was not right to punish him for something that his father did. The two representatives tried to calm both parties and to reach an agreement but were not successful. The mi'ad dissolved with Hassanein not only insisting on keeping his daughter, but also threatening to marry her to a rich man in the area. The case was not solved by the time I left the field.

593
586 Taking his daughter away from the marital residence is treated as an undisputed right of the father. This is true whether he is justified in his actions or not and whether the girl approves of her father's decision or not. The general view is that the father, having raised his daughter, is entitled to her obedience and that taking her away from her husband, even against her will, is the symbol of authority over her. It also signifies that the girl has someone to look after her, to protect her and prevent the husband or any member of his family from mistreating her. Awlad Ali differentiate, however, between cases in which the father has exercised his right in an arbitrary and unreasonable manner and those in which he has reasonable grounds for his actions. A father is considered justified in taking his daughter away if her husband or members of his family fail to fulfill their obligations towards the wife or members of her family. Mistreatment of the woman (the definition of which will be discussed later), and disrespect to members of her family, or preventing her from visiting her family or them visiting her in the customary specified manner are always justifiable grounds. As a [681] justifiable action, the father is not obliged to return his daughter until he gets full apologies and any gifts for the woman or himself that he considers as kabara. If the husband refuses to concede to the demands of the father, the latter can force him to divorce her without having to return the bridewealth to the husband. Although the father's right still exists when no justifiable grounds are present, in this case he is required to return his daughter to her husband after a short period. If he refuses, [681] the husband is entitled to ask for a kabara. He also can divorce his [583] wife and is entitled to get back his mahr and possible all the marriage expenses. It is this possibility of having to pay back the mahr and

593 and expenses to the husband that constitutes the most important check
586 on the otherwise undisputed right of the father to take away his
(583) daughter.

593 The woman, on the other hand, cannot refuse to go with her father,
562 for this means that she would be disobeying him. A woman who disobeys
586 her father is not worthy of his name. He can cut her off from the family, which means that she is left without any support or protection. A woman who is cut off from her family is left vulnerable to her husband and to society. She will have nobody to defend her or to be responsible for her actions. The responsibility for the woman's behavior is not transferred by marriage to the husband or his family.

682 If the woman kills or assaults someone or causes damage to property
683 for which compensation is required, her male kin pays the blood money or
602 the compensation on her behalf. It is sometimes stated that if the woman
613 has grown-up sons, they, and not her family, pay for her. Since the
562 children belong to their father's family, it may seem like transfering
593 the responsibility for the woman's actions to her husband's family. However, in all three cases where this happened, the woman was quite old, her father was dead, and her brothers were either dead or had moved outside the area and had cut off all relations with the area. She also had no nephews in the area. In such cases, the sons were the woman's closest male kin.

682 On the other hand, if the woman is the victim of murder or assault
683 for which blood money or compensation is to be paid, the husband is the
593 one to benefit from the situation. To understand why this happens, we
562 have to consider the contractual nature of marriage among Awlad Ali. It
584 has been mentioned earlier that before marriage is final, the prospective
583

of drastic actions taken in cases of adultery. Of the fourteen cases of adultery that I examined furing my field work, none resulted in the killing of the adulteress, and only three resulted in the murder of her partner. In all three cases where the adulterer was killed, the avenger was the husband; and in all three cases, the husband had to pay the bloodmoney to the murdered man's kin group. His payment of the blood-money, among other things, may indicate that the right of the husband to kill the adulterer is not completely accepted among Awlad Ali. All agree, however, that such killings never result in blood feuds because of the shameful circumstances in which the victim dies.

It was very difficult to obtain any detailed or reliable information about adultery cases. All the above mentioned fourteen cases were gathered from the informants, twelve of which were cases which had already been solved. For the two cases which were still open at the time of the study, information was quite vague. Usually such cases are conducted with a great amount of secrecy, with the involved parties referring to them as cases of theft, or merely by saying that the cases involve women. Only when the adultery leads to the killing of the adulteress or the adulterer are more details publicly known about the case.

But while the right to retaliate for the shameful action of an adulterous wife is vague and diffused, the right of the husband for compensation from the adulterer remains clear and undisputed. In this resepct, adultery is treated very much like theft; the adulterer has stolen the husband's exclusive right to his wife's sexual activities. The compensation for this offense is estimated at L.E. 20, in addition to the mahr, if the husband decides to divorce his wife as a result of her adultery.

581 585 562 671 Marriage does not deprive the woman of some rights of her own. The customary law gives the wife three basic rights corresponding to those of the husband's sexual services, domestic work, and obedience. Corresponding to the first of these, the wife has the right to have a normal sexual life with her husband. This right, however, is not an exclusive one, since the husband can marry more than one wife. A woman 585 586 593 can be divorced from her husband without having to return the mahr if she claims that the husband is unable to perform his sexual duties. In such cases, the marriage is usually dissolved quietly. In certain rare instances, the husband may deny his wife's accusations. If both insist 585 586 593 627 on their stand, one or both may ask to be submitted to "bait el-shana'a," or house of the dreadful deeds. Reports are extremely vague about the exact procedures involved in this case. Some informants stated that the married couple would live in a tent without sidewalls so that everybody could see what goes on inside. Most informants, however, insist that it merely means that the couple move their tent near that of a respectable man whose word is believed and honored. This man is supposed to keep a close watch on the couple's activities, by listening or looking through holes in the tent. His verdict determines the future of the marriage. 582 681 559 If the wife is justified in her claim, the husband is forced to divorce her and to forfeit his mahr. If, on the other hand, the verdict is for the husband, he not only can divorce her and get back the mahr, but is also entitled to kabara, or compensation, for his injured pride. There 114 178 583 is no case of bait el-shana'a in the area during the time of the field work, and most people insist that this practice is something of the past when the mahr was relatively high and was paid in livestock, in which

case its return to the husband would have caused great financial inconvenience for the wife's family.

Corresponding to the second right, the husband's right to his wife's domestic work, is the wife's right to maintenance. The husband has to support his wife. This includes providing her and her children with adequate food and proper clothing. If the husband fails to do so because of poverty, sickness, crop failure or unexpected disaster, the wife's brother or father provides her and her children with the necessary food and clothing. If the husband's failure to fulfill his duties is due to neglect, the wife can leave him and go to her father or brother who talks the matter over with the husband who, in turn, either agrees to their demands or has to divorce his wife and forfeit his mahr.

Finally, corresponding to the husband's right to his wife's obedience is the wife's right to fair treatment by her husband. There are a number of ways in which the wife is mistreated. One is excessive punishment; although the right of the husband to punish his wife is provided in the Koraan, the punishment must be excessive or severe. Awlad Ali draw a line between acceptable and severe punishment. A punishment is severe if it results in something that other people can see or hear. If the husband insults his wife or her family and others hear the action, or if he beats her and this results in visible traces, then the punishment is severe.

A wife considers herself mistreated if the husband, when married to more than one, treats any of the other wives better than he treats her. Although the wife cannot deny her husband the right to have additional wives, he must give them all equal treatment. This includes

593 providing them with the same kind of food and clothing.* It also in-
595 cludes dividing his time equally between them, spending one night in
562 each wife's tent. The first wife, being the chief one, has certain privileges: her tent is the guest house, food is brought to her residence, and she is the one to divide it among the other wives, and her house is the place for the husband to stay if he becomes sick and unable to move every night from one tent to another. Other than the exceptions given to the first wife, the husband has to treat all his wives equally.

593 Normally, such cases of mistreatment do not result in divorce un-
(586) less they are persistent. In most cases, if the wife is mistreated, she goes to her father's or brother's house or sends for them to come and
593 take her. For the husband to bring her back to his tent, he must pay
431 her "nasafa." This is a gift given by the husband to his wife as an acknowledgement of guilt and as a form of apology for not giving her fair treatment. In some cases the nasafa is equal to what the husband originally paid as mahr.

581 These are some of the rights that marriage gives both men and women
585 in the tribal society of Awlad Ali. These rights, however, are useless
626 unless they are backed by certain means of enforcing them. The husband's
586 rights are guaranteed by his ability to dissolve the marriage at will.
626 According to Islamic law, a man can divorce his wife by simply pronounc-
593 ing the sentence "I divorce you" in the presence of credible witnesses.
(779) No justification for divorce is demanded from the husband according to
(562) the Koraan. No such privilege is given to the wife. She can obtain a

---

* With provision for wives with more children.

586 626 593 [562] [774] divorce only under specific circumstances in the absence of which the husband can force her to live with him. Following the Koraanic rules, Awlad Ali give men the right to dissolve the marriage at will and without any necessary justification; however, they differentiate between cases where divorce is justified and those in which it is not. In a case of justifiable divorce, the husband can take back the mahr and possibly all other marriage expenses. In the case of unjustifiable divorce, the husband forfeits his right to regain the mahr. Divorce is justified whenever one or more of the husband's rights are violated by the wife or members of her family. Not all degrees of violation are considered as justification for divorce, however. Only intolerable violations can be considered as such. In deciding whether or not an act constitutes an [183] intolerable violation, Awlad Ali judge it against the standard of the reasonable man, the customary man, and what he would have tolerated in a similar situation.

586 183 554 What constitutes reasonable behavior does not only vary according to the situation and the manner in which the actions are taken, but also with the relative position in the social structure of the parties involved and their initial relations to one another. In the case of divorce, what constitutes grounds for justifiable divorce in one case may not be sufficient grounds for justifiable divorce in another. In one of 586 183 554 511 the cases I witnessed during the year of study, a man who divorced his wife because of her insistence that he buy her meat from the market every day of the week, was forced to forfeit his right to redeem the [114] mahr on the basis that the wife's actions had not established a basis for justifiable divorce. In the negotiations that followed, the position of the husband, as well as that of the family of the wife, were discussed.

586 183 554 511 The husband had a big herd by the standards of the tribe (600 sheep and goats). In addition, he also cultivated a large stretch of the fig land in the coastal area and was making good money. In other words, the husband could afford the standard of living the wife demanded. The other question that was discussed was the actions of the wife herself. She was the daughter of one of the wealthiest members of the same tribe as her husband; and according to the people who knew her, she was used to meat every day of the week. In other cases, similar demands by the wife to have a certain kind of food or to be clothed in certain kinds of material were considered as an intolerable situation, and the husband was justified in his divorcing her and had the right to retrieve his mahr. This was obvious in the case of one of my informants whose wife insisted that every time he went to Alexandria, he bring her silk material for a dress. Since the husband could not afford to meet her demands, her insistence was considered as grounds for the husband. The assessment of reasonableness on the part of the husband in his divorce action and therefore his right to the mahr paid is frequently influenced by the relative position of the husband and the wife's guardian in the social structure. An influential man who marries his daughter to a poor relative or nephew rarely has to return the mahr.

586 183 554

586 562 Although women among Awlad Ali are not given the same legal right of divorcing the husband by pronouncing the "dismissal formula," they are given the right of certain customary procedures which in practice give them equal facilities for dissolving the marriage. This is known as the right of the woman to "throw herself." This means that the woman takes all her clothes and sometimes her children and goes to the dwelling of

[574]

586 562 574 the man she chooses. She informs him before she enters his house that she is the wife of so and so and the daughter of so and so and that she is throwing herself on him to protect her from her husband with whom she no longer wishes to live. Like the right of refuge, the man cannot [778] refuse to let her in; and from this moment until her dispute with her husband is resolved, she is considered as his house guest and is entitled to all the hospitality a guest receives. If he refuses to extend that hospitality [629] or refuses to take her in, she can ask for a mi'ad [681] and is entitled to kabara from him. There has been no reported incidents in which a man refused that right to a woman. As soon as she settles down in the host's house, the latter takes immediate measures to find the husband and to convince him to let his wife go. In doing this, the man uses all the power of persuasion. The man selected for this purpose 586 562 574 is usually a respected man who can put pressure upon the husband. Sometimes he has to bribe the husband to release the wife, paying from his 554 own money. The man has to have money, not only to be able to support [556] the wife during her stay in his house and to bribe the husband, but also because in certain instances he has to pay the husband the mahr that the father of the wife had taken in order to free her. The next step after getting the agreement of the husband to divorce his wife is to contact the father of the wife or her guardian and convince him to pay the mahr to the husband. If the father does not agree, or if he is financially unable to do so, the man on whom the woman has thrown herself is supposed to pay from his own money. In cases where the woman left the husband to be married to another man with whom she had had a relationship, the respected man tries to have the future husband pay the present husband the mahr he is supposed to pay the woman after she is divorced from her

husband. In a number of cases the husband was willing to divorce the woman after a promise by the man that she would pay him the mahr when she got married. In most cases, however, the process costs the man a considerable amount of money. Sometimes, when the woman is young and attractive, the man finds it to his advantage to keep her as his wife, since she will cost him no more expenses. On the other hand, the man cannot refuse a woman the right of refuge, since to do this or to deny her the right of hospitality will make him liable to pay kabara if she made the refusal known publicly. On the other hand, it is prestigious to be known in the area as a man to whom women go to be released from their husbands. In fact, a man who acquires a reputation of getting wives released is likely to be sought as mardi in other cases as well.

Due to the nature of his role in mediating, the woman must be careful in selecting the man over whom she throws herself. These considerations are manifested in the following case taken from my field notes. Hadia was forced by her father to marry a man from the same tribe who paid her father L.E. 100 as mahr. She did not want to marry him because she was in love with someone else of whom her father did not approve. One month after she was married, she left the tent and never came back. Later, she appeared in the house of Omda Ali, the chief of another tribe, and everyone knew that she had thrown herself on him. She later told me why she had selected Omda Ali and not the Omda of her own tribe. "Because my husband works for the Omda of my own tribe, and I thought he would be biased. Of course, I couldn't have gone to my father; he was the one who forced me to marry that man. Omda Ali is very respected and can support me... He is also rich and is known for releasing wives from their husbands." Omda Ali called the husband in and asked him to divorce

586 562 594 554 634 his wife. The husband agreed but insisted that she pay him L.E. 300 (this included the mahr and the marriage expenses). The Omda tried to reduce the amount but could not. He then tried to get the father to pay, but the father refused. He had to pay the husband L.E. 200 of his own money and promised that the rest would be paid when the woman remarried (it would be paid from the mahr). The husband divorced Haida. One week later she was married to her lover. I have no information about whether or not the 100 pounds was paid.

586 562 594 554 792 In another example, Sabha was forced by her father to marry her cousin (ibn 'amm). She could not live with him, so she threw herself on one of the holy men in the area. The holy man convinced the husband to divorce Sabha and then went to her father and convinced him to pay back the mahr to the husband, and the case was settled. People say (626) that both the husband and the father agreed to the demands of the holy man because they were afraid of his supernatural curse. Sabha went back to her father's house.

586 562 593 (554) (594) It is obvious from these and similar cases that the success or failure of the procedure depends on the careful selection of the man on whom a woman throws herself. It is also apparent from the above examples that his right of refuge is resorted to only in cases where the woman cannot go to her father or to her closest kin to help her get a divorce because he is either unable or unwilling to help her. A father is unable to help if the husband is powerful or if he is the woman's ibn 'amm (father's brother's son) who has, according to the tribal law, the undisputed right to marry his bint 'amm (father's brother's daughter). The father is usually unwilling to help his daughter if he is the one

586 562 593 who forced her to marry the husband, or if she was cut off from the family for some reason or another.

586 562 574 622 From the frequency of women using this right in the area, it seems that no social disapproval is associated with it, nor is there a social stigma attached to women who throw themselves. They seem to find it as easy to find a husband as those women divorced voluntarily by their husbands or with the help of their fathers. In fact, as was 586 562 mentioned earlier, many of them marry the rich men over whom they 587 throw themselves. As to the amount of mahr paid for their subsequent [583] marriages, the fact of throwing themselves does not seem to be a factor [574] in determining the amount of mahr paid. In one of the cases, the woman threw herself on an 'aqila of one of the Geneishat tribe after her father refused to help her get a divorce from her husband who had married a second wife without first asking the first wife's permission. [429] When the Geneishat member succeeded in convincing the husband to divorce his wife, the latter had no place to stay so remained in the house of her protector who acted as her guardian in place of her father [583] who had refused to take her back in his home. While staying in the house of her protector, she got many marriage offers; one of the suitors offered a mahr of L.E. 4,000 ($10,000), one of the highest mahrs reported in the area. She agreed, and the marriage was affected. This mahr is about ten times the mahr she got for her first marriage. This 586 562 procedure offers the woman a considerable guarantee of her marital rights. It also gives her, as far as the ability to dissolve the marriage, a status close to that of her husband. This relative equality is reflected is reflected in the lack of stigma associated with divorced

586 562 women in the Western Desert, and that the women usually have no difficulty in finding another husband.

586 562 593 768 While the right of "throwing herself" offers the wife some guarantee of her rights, her main guarantee is derived from the security she gets from retaining membership in her father's family. After the death of the father, the woman's claims extend to the households of her brothers. She acquires in them the same rights she had in her father's household, and the brothers take the responsibility of their father in protecting and defending their sister. The woman achieves this continuation of support partially through forfeiting her rights of inheritance to her brothers. [428]

562 428 [199] Awlad Ali recognize the right of the daughters to inherit in their father's estate. They accept the system of inheritance specified in the Koraan which gives the woman half the share of her brother. In practice, this is usually side-stepped. Only sons inherit their father's property. The justification given for the non-inheritance of women is that the main items of inheritance in the Western Desert, livestock and the right of land use, require certain protection and care which are beyond the culturally defined roles of women. Livestock require moving from one grazing ground to another, almost always crossing tribal lands belonging to various tribal segments, some of whom might be hostile. It also requires the ability to protect the herds from predators and from raids, especially in earlier times. Similarly, land requires preparation and protection against trespassers, especially when the barley is growing. [233] [311]

562 428 593 Women, however, are supposed to be compensated by their brothers for their shares. But very few would actually ask their brothers for

159 the relationship between her and her brothers.
562
428 Following her action and until the time of the study, they had
593 never visited her and she had never visited them. Her husband took
[237] care of the herd; and the arrangement worked out all right until the
159 husband told Fatma one day that he was going to marry a second wife.
562 She refused, but he went ahead with the marriage without her consent.
593
595 He brought the new wife to live with Fatma in the same tin hut in which
they were living. He started to pay more attention to the new wife and
to neglect Fatma; whenever the latter complained, he beat her. Then,
before one of the religious feasts, he sold two of Fatma's sheep and
bought his new wife a dress and a silver bracelet. When Fatma objected
[144] and they argued, he hit her with a stick on the head; she was hospital-
ized for a week with a serious head wound. While in the hospital, she
went to her brothers who lived only two miles away, but they refused to
159 come to her assistance. She then went to sheikh Elewa (the aqila of
562 Bait Asabei) and threw herself on him. He met with the husband and con-
594 vinced him to divorce Fatma. He kept forty sheep of Fatma's herd as com-
593 pensation for the mahr he had paid her and the marriage expenses, then
595 took his new wife and moved from Fatma's hut. Fatma then returned and
• 586 managed her financial affairs successfully herself. She managed the
159 store and hired a shepherd to take care of the sheep. At the time of
562 the present study she was respected by almost everybody in the area, in-
444 cluding members of the local administration. She is known to be reason-
[233] able and of sound opinion, and her store functions as the meeting place
[829] for many of the tribal mi'ads and for casual conversations. She is also
[521] considered as a liason between the tribal population in the area and the
local government administration, and is respected by both sides.

wife he usually chooses a young girl of about twenty years. Children of the elder wife might be adult, therefore, when the children of the junior wife are infants. Great emphasis is placed on seniority, particularly among males, but strong emphasis is also placed on the equality of siblings and their equal legal status. Between brothers of widely differing ages, there is, then, this field of potential conflict. From an early date competitive, if not hostile, relationships develop between the sons of co-wives. Competition between half-brothers results not only from their mothers being co-wives: one group might be the sons of a divorced wife. The latter situation is often much worse, for the sons born of the divorced wife are now being fostered by a woman who is not their mother. A similar condition of things is brought about when a widower with sons remarries. Yet again, when a wife grows old and her sons have reached maturity, her husband may not divorce her formally, but merely 'throw her off his back'; she will then go to live with her grown sons, while her husband, in turn, takes a new wife, usually taking up residence in another camp for a time at least. It would be too much of a digression here to discuss the inheritance disputes, and the disputes over marriage and bride-wealth, which arise out of these various circumstances. Suffice it to note that such disputes are common and affect the alignment of people within a tertiary segment.

As half-brothers grow to maturity some of them will marry their maternal cross-cousins, and in succeeding generations some of their descendants will do likewise. In this way, a tertiary segment united by the bond of agnation, will also have within it smaller groups of kin having different sets of cognatic links. This group, as a residential unit, shows a very high concentration of agnates, and the Bedouin say with pride that members of the camps are always 'one' because of this agnatic bond, and indeed, the corporate identity of this group is strikingly displayed in many circumstances. It does not take precedence in all circumstances, for, built into agnation, with the heavy burden of duties which go with it, are serious stresses and strains which in some circumstances regularly come out into the open. In yet other circumstances cognatic kinship affiliations appear to be dominant, causing friction among agnates. A man, for example, may permit

indeed welcome unfaithfulness on his wife's part. If a man is very old, and his wife very young, it is likely that she will entertain lovers; if a man leaves camp for a long absence his wife may not remain chaste. In both cases, if the liaisons lead to the birth of a child, particularly a male, the husband greets the news with unrestrained enthusiasm — "praise be to God," as their saying goes. Incapacity[7] to produce offspring, if a husband is convinced of it, may lead him to delegate a kinsman to serve his wife for procreative purposes: he has the legal authority, as husband, to do so, and to require his wife to submit, for the only alternative, if he is not to die without "issue," is to "take" a son from his brother and fulfill the obligations towards this boy required of a pater, namely, attend to his circumcision, provide him with teaching in the Koran (a duty neglected by most) and give him the wealth with which to marry.

Granting the acceptance of paternity, whatever the circumstances of conception, a male child, *ipso facto*, acceeds to membership of a corporation, and is subject to the authority of that group in a number of matters. In many situations it would appear that a son is under the father's political control. At a moot, the son, if he speaks at all, will do so only to corroborate his father. Discussions among men in a small camp evoke a similar pattern of behaviour. Until the father becomes senile or dies, a son cannot publicly pursue an independent course, but he desists by virtue of his relationships with his father *qua* pater, not because of his father's political power to coerce. All men of a corporation, in any event, "speak with one word" at a moot, and a son, by his assent to the common view, also supports his father; in so doing he yields to the political authority of his corporation, and not that of his father.

Membership in the corporation invests a man with other privileges and duties. Protection against external enemies comes within the corporation's jurisdiction, although in a particular situation, the father may well be the person who dispenses it. Complimentarily, if a man commits an offense against a person not of his group, whatever private thoughts his father may have about the act, the responsibility lies not on his shoulders but on the group, and he is compelled to share this responsibility equally with all other members. For example, if a son commits a homicide the father bears the same legal responsibility for the act, and is under obligation to contribute the same share of blood-money as he would be if the act had been perpetrated by any male of the group other than his son. Even in a narrower field of relations between father and son the group exercises its authority. Acting as pater, a man may punish his son, physically or otherwise; he may not do so to the point of injury, for personal injury comes within the legitimate sphere of the corporation. A man's "bone" belongs to his group; he is an in-

[7] Impotency is a special case, because it is dishonourable for a woman to remain wife to an impotent man. She cannot divorce him, but her father can insist on a witnessed test of impotency and, if it is proven, the husband is compelled to divorce her. Barrenness, obviously, is a different matter.

8: Kennett G-5 (ca. 1921) 1925 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9

682 charge, which hit Towida at a range of only a few feet,
672 with fatal results.

Farag, who had divorced her two months before,
682 brought a claim for bloodmoney from Korayem; but when
672 the case was heard, Korayem denied that the accident had
695 happened in his tent. The assessors of this first court, which was held soon after the accident, demanded that Korayem should swear, backed by twenty-five men (i.e. half the full number of fifty, as Towida was a woman), that the accident did not take place in his tent. Then
[671] followed an example of one of the very unsatisfactory points in Bedouin Law.

Korayem, who was a powerful man belonging to the Gereidat, who were in turn a powerful family, managed to persuade the court to cancel their judgment requiring the oath from himself and his twenty-five backers, and to agree to a settlement whereby he should pay £10 and be absolved from the necessity of taking the oath. The court accepted this agreement, and proceeded to examine the claims to the bloodmoney.

The Moslem Law of Divorce provides that when a man
682 divorces his wife, the decree does not become absolute for
672 three months, in order that it may be ascertained whether
695 the woman be pregnant by her lately divorced husband.
671 Towida had only been divorced two months before the accident; so the question had to be decided whether Farag
• 586 were legally her husband or not at the time of her death, for purposes of receiving a share of the bloodmoney. If so, he should receive one quarter; but there seems to have been some difference of opinion on this point among the assessors of the court, and the whole matter was shelved.

Seventeen years afterwards, Lataif Farag—then a man
682 of twenty-one—re-opened the case, claiming his mother's
672 bloodmoney. In support of his claim he produced three
695 witnesses. The first was Farag himself, who was prepared
694 to swear that he had seen Towida lying dead in the tent of Korayem. The second was Towida's brother, who was